

something else is faulty, and wherein it differs from what is good.

Now, if it be not an unwarrantable trespass, I would humbly propose to take a rapid sketch of the ground over which every one so qualified to appreciate architectural excellence should have passed,—of the architectural principles with which every one should be acquainted, and with which every one may easily be acquainted. I address myself, of course, to those who have paid little attention to their ideas on this subject. I beg the forbearance of those who know well all that I may be able to say. I hope, however, that truths, even the most elementary, never can, if fairly and clearly stated, be altogether uninteresting and tiresome, even to the most skilful and experienced.

In this endeavour to sketch out the ground over which the amateur student in architecture may be supposed to pass—the manner in which he should observe, as he goes along, and the objects he should keep before him, I need not now speak of Indian and Egyptian buildings. They are deeply interesting subjects; but they are not only too difficult for a sketch; they lie also removed from our present purpose. The student then begins, I suppose, with Grecian architecture. Whether it be derived at all from Egypt, or how far it arose from it, or copied it, is not now the question. It is a contested point. But we may take it as we find it; and the first step, I conceive, is to gain a thorough acquaintance with the details and effects—the spirit and the letter—of classical architecture, as developed in the three Greek orders, the Doric, the Ionic, and the Corinthian. To a certain extent this is easily attained: treatises abound.

The articles in the "Encyclopædia Metropolitana" and "Encyclopædia Britannica" furnish very fair measures of information. The plates in the "Encyclopædia Metropolitana" are beautiful: The article is written by Mr. Norton, of the Royal Military College. The terms of art should be carefully studied, and well understood; but let it be remembered that it is not merely the power of knowing terms that the intelligent observer of classical models should possess, but also the power of appreciating their beauty—their fitness in their own position. It is not enough to talk of Architrave, Frieze, Cornice, Mutule, Modûles, Propylæum, Prostylos, Cymatium, Pycnostylion, &c. &c. He must feel how they bear upon one another, and how they conjointly produce that effect which this style of architecture, and this alone, is calculated to produce upon the mind. The effect of Grecian architecture is not like effects in Gothic architecture—vast, complex, bewildering, infinite: it is one pure and harmonious whole. You cannot change the proportions—you cannot vary the outline—you cannot combine one order with another—you cannot make a new order intermediate between those already existing. There stand the three orders in their inimitable beauty—monuments of Grecian art—monuments of the perfect and graceful conceptions of the Grecian mind. Like reading the finest works of Greek authors, a contemplation of Greek temples conveys the idea of a production in itself perfect—should convey the idea of unbroken symmetry. Nor is there a want of variety in such effects. Each order has its peculiar character, and is entire in itself. The Doric is severe grandeur and majesty are its distinguishing attributes. The Ionic is graceful, elegant, and, at the same time, simple, and free from elaborate detail. The Corinthian is full of ornament, rich in detail, and yet how simply beautiful in its effect—how commanding.

We might say how dignified in its proportions. We can almost fancy an enthusiastic lover of Grecian art personifying the three orders, and able to realise, through the outlines of the stones, prevailing minds and permeating intelligence. But I must not indulge in these abstractions. Should any one be disposed to study the moral sentiment and the mystical emotions that can be deduced from architecture, let him ponder over one of the most extraordinary productions of our day—a work by a graduate of Oxford, entitled "The

Seven Lamps of Architecture." On the question of beauty, as associated with Grecian architecture, I need hardly remind the student of Lord Aberdeen's small but admirable treatise.

But we suppose the student has now gained a fair knowledge of the parts and details and proportions of the three orders of Grecian architecture. He finds his next step is a modification of these orders in their character, and an increase in their number. The Romans altered—I do not know why we should say corrupted—Grecian architecture. They added—why should we say they interpolated—two orders, the Tuscan and the Composite; and they brought the art to bear upon the additional uses which they found for it. Let it not be forgotten, that pure and lovely as was the Grecian architecture, it was only applied to one object, the Temple. There was no habitable interior. The style was not used with them for domestic purposes at all. It is a mere exterior, so far as the spectator is concerned. The Greek sacred architecture was internally a simple cell of narrow dimensions to contain a single statue. But the Romans required more. They had to build bridges, baths, aqueducts, palaces; and accordingly they enlarge the sphere of their architectural elements. The great power which they possessed in marble and stone was, that they could turn the arch—they had the vaulted roof—they had the dome or cupola. Here, then, are new powers and new capacities for grand effect. Buildings gain height, and expand into great dimensions. The student examines that alteration of the severe features of Grecian art which renders it an adaptation for Roman purposes: new combinations of elements are to be considered—new embellishments—as for instance, the archivolts of the curtilical part are to be ornamented. New resources are required for filling up the spaces of the extended fronts, and (in comparison of the severe Grecian colonnade and pediment) the elaborate and complex elevations of their buildings. Whilst going through the Roman style, the student observes its purity in the severe and earlier department immediately arising from the Hellenic. He then traces it on to a state of comparative corruption and debasement, and again marks its restoration in a magnificent and plastic form, under such minds as Gaius Romulus, Michelangelo, and Palladio—a form which was introduced and naturalized in this country, especially by Sir Christopher Wren and Inigo Jones.

But now the student is prepared for a new and a very different style of building—a style, on the history and the origin of which there has been controversy without end, and, I may add, a great deal of controversy without meaning. The name certainly is unfortunate,—"Gothic,"—for it has as little to do with Goths as it has with Egypt; and I fear the name was given in scorn as equivalent to barbarous—being borrowed from the Italian writers of the fifteenth century, who contemptuously applied the term to all works of art in the middle ages. From them Wren is the first English writer who uses it. Still the term is there, and we must be satisfied to retain it. A name is difficult to alter, and if we know what it exactly means, it answers the purpose. Nor does it appear to me that the names proposed would be altogether suitable: for instance, "Pointed" architecture is not a correct term, for an essential part of it is circular: "Ecclesiastical" is not, because it is not confined to ecclesiastical purposes, and many ecclesiastical edifices do not adopt it: "Christian" is not, because in a great part of Christendom it is not used, and never was used. But to pass from the name to the thing. Out of the Roman architecture there arose two styles or orders of building, used especially for church building—the Lombard and the Norman. Of the former I have little to say. It is the ordinary type of churches in Italy. It has many enthusiastic admirers, and none more liberal and intelligent than the Honourable Sydney Herbert, who, at his own cost, and at a great expense, has built a complete—a beautiful—I may add, a gorgeous—church in

this character, at Wilton, near Salisbury. It is a fine edifice, rich and glowing with variety of colouring—agate, jasper, lapis lazuli, carving, gold stars, azure, and gilded vaults. It is impossible not to admire it as a mere artistic production, but as a church edifice my associations do not go along with it. Of the Norman style we may simply say that at first it has the appearance of a debased and inferior Roman. The pillars are enormous, sometimes little more than a diameter in height; the arches ponderous and unadorned; the vaulting or groining mere massive ribs and cross-springers; the windows without tracery, and the capitals of the piers, instead of the fine delicate Ionic volutes, or rich Corinthian acanthus, are grotesque imitations, or sometimes cut plain off on four sides, making a square top,—as if the architect, in despair, had determined to adventure nothing: the doorways, even the earliest, are sometimes very rich, the whole carried round with profusion of ornament. The principal of these ornaments, and one very different from any in the previous styles, is the chevron or zigzag. I know it is said to have been traced to some ornament in the Church of St. John, built by Constantine outside the Roman walls. Still, how it came, and how it was used in such profusion, seems a mystery. The Norman doors abound with decorations of chevron, cable, billet, nail-head, beak-head, and ornament, &c., as may be seen in great preservation at Durham, Malmesbury, Illey, Northampton, &c. It was worked to great nicety and perfection in Normandy, as at Caen, in several churches, and especially St. Stephens, where the true Norman style is executed with a rich and finished effect of which we have no example in this country—not there confined to doors or portions, but extending entirely through the whole building, interior and exterior. This, I suspect, was carried on there whilst the English architects were working at the more pointed forms of church architecture.

At this word Pointed architecture springs up the great contest—What is the origin of Pointed architecture? Where did it originate? Who first adopted it? It came from imitating trees in an avenue—it came from the intersection of arches at St. Cross—it came from the East—it came from the pointed timbers of Noah's Ark. With all this, except as matter of curiosity and matter of history, the student has no concern. *It is not the Pointed architecture growing out of that which went before it.* Every step is so resorted back into some previous modification of Norman work: in fact, there exists a style of transition between the one and the other—between the Norman and the first Pointed—called by some architectural writers semi-Norman. What more can be required? You see the circular arch taking a sharper sweep—you see the heavy piers clustering into four smaller, or becoming one smaller, with many shafts set round—you see the windows becoming narrow as the arch becomes sharp, so as to make the lancet: the capitals are reduced, and foliage set round the former blank sections of the Norman: the chevron is raised forward, and brought to angular points, like a little pyramid, and, in fact, as I have said, the one style passes into the other, and even some time after it has been advanced as at the north transept of York, retaining some circular character of the Norman from which it sprang. When we see the Pointed style gradually and imperceptibly growing out of the previous Norman, we require no other origin. It stands out before us, and we discern the steps by which the successive workmen had brought it to perfection. Most satisfactory specimens of this transition are found at Carterbury and at Romsey, in Hants. Sir Christopher Wren and other respectable names are quoted for the eastern origin of Pointed architecture. But they gave the opinion without study, and without consideration. Britton, and other more practical writers, have proved that at Acre, Jerusalem, and other places, the specimens of Pointed architecture referred to as being found in them at their capture had been built by Christians themselves—for Acre was not taken

* Mr. Goodall's drawings and measurements of the Parthenon and other buildings are invaluable.